

**Julian Community Planning Group
Special Meeting Minutes
January 23, 2012
Final**

Call to order: 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call of Members: Shelver (p), Barnes (p), Bryan (p), Birdsell (e), Brown (p), Law (p), Moretti (p), Mushet (p), Redding (p), Rikansrud (p), Verdugo (p).
P-Present, E-Excused, U-Unexcused

2. Item of Business:

Review and prepare recommendations on the Task Force Report to be submitted to the Department of Planning and Land Use and the County Board of Supervisors;

Overview- The Task Force Report on Red Tape Reduction has recommended the elimination of Community Planning Groups **or** The retention of Community Planning Groups with severely limited powers, size and limits of terms. In addition the Report on Red Tape Reduction recommends several changes in how the DPLU reviews and processes certain land use regulations.

Item 1 Recommendation: Remove Community Planning and Sponsor Groups from the County's "umbrella" and rescind Board Policy I-1; and require applicants for discretionary permits to prepare a Public Participation Plan (PPP) to "inform residents of the community of the proposed project. The PPP shall be required for the following projects: TPM's, TM's, MUP's. Rezones, Specific Plans, General Plan Amendments or other similar permit types. The PPP shall include one publicly noticed meeting to be held in the community.

Response: We are opposed to this recommendation. Planning/Sponsor Groups represent the only practical process for local community review of the variety of land use issues considered by DPLU staff, Planning Commission and the Bof S . It is the only way for staff, Commission, and Board to receive local review of land use actions including community features, community history and unique characteristics of each community within the unincorporated area of the County. History of the current process has shown that CPG/CSG review and recommendations have resulted in better projects for the community, the County and the applicant. The recommended PPP as describe above is merely meant to "inform the residents of the community" rather than to solicit comments or recommendations from the community. We believe that the suggested alternative to local review grou (CPG/CSG) is a giant step away from transparency in the land use planning process. **M/S/C (Barnes, Redding).**

Item II. Recommendations regarding an alternative to the elimination of Planning/Sponsor groups

1. Limit the scope of their review to preparation and amendment of the General Plan and Community plan and the PPP as described below.

Response: Items under this recommendation that would NOT receive CPG/CSG review and recommendation, such a Use permits, Subdivision, assignment of PLDO funds, etc. are precisely the land use actions that should be reviewed locally by an unbiased group and not by a process established by the applicant. Use of the PPP process would be totally inadequate. PLDO funds especially should remain under the CPG/CSG review. They are the only process for the Community to contribute to actions affecting many government properties owned in the area. **M/S/C (Barnes/Moretti).**

2. Staff each CPG meeting with a senior level planner and County Counsel.

Response; This would be totally unnecessary and extremely expensive. If the goal is to avoid lawsuits, we believe that litigation can be minimized with appropriate training of CPG/CSG members and chairperson. The training should be mandated and include such areas as

the review process, the Brown Act, Form 700 filing, and Ethics issues. There should be penalties in place for Group and /or members that are caught violating the rules or inappropriate behavior. The history of Brown Act violations and other inappropriate behavior has been extremely rare and can be further minimized with the training suggested above. There is no evidence that it would be minimized any further with “senior level staff and County Council presence at each CPG/CSG meeting. **MSC(Barnes/Rikansrub).**

3. Institute term limits on CPG members to a maximum of two, two-year terms, in a ten year period:

Response: Against any term limits. In order for the Groups to have continuity with Chairs and DPLU and a history of knowledge pertaining to continuing projects, term limits must not be permitted. In the case that term limits will be implemented, we support **two, four year terms with a two year sit out. M/S/C (Barnes, Brown).**

4. Limit the number of CPG members for each group to seven.

Response: We support a 7-13 member group based on Community Characteristics. Each group shall submit a report to the Board of Supervisors with a rationale for their recommendation regarding the future size of the Group. **M/S/C (Moretti, Rikansrud).**

5. Revise Board Policy I-1 to reflect the changes listed herein.

Response: We don't object to this recommendation with the understanding that if our recommendations are implemented there would be little need to moodily Board Policy I-1. **M/S/C (Brown, Barnes).**

6. Revise the Fee Ordinance to clarify that CPG's no longer receive free appeals to the Board of Supervisors:

Response: This recommendation does not have merit and we strongly object to it. CPG's and CSG's represent community interests and not the individual interests of applicants or individual members of CPG's and CSG's. CPG's and CSG's represent their communities but are not funded by their communities and so if they feel that an injustice has occurred by DPLU staff or Planning Commission they should have the right to appeal without the individual Group members having to fund the appeal. Requiring payment of a fee would be an unreasonable and unrealistic burden on volunteers. **M/S/C (Redding, Barnes).**

7. Require applicants for discretionary permits to prepare a Public Participation Plan.

Response: If our recommendations are approved this process is unnecessary. Further, we believe that the PPP process appears to be designed to stifle community interest in land use matters and would be self serving for the applicants who would prepare the PPP. It would appear that allowing the applicant to determine how the community is informed and allowed to review projects is a sham, as the applicants best interest is served by minimizing transparency and excluding the community from the review process. **M/S/C (Barnes/ Moretti).**

The Red Tape Reduction Task Force report has suggested two alternatives for revision of the land use application and permit process. We find both of them to be unacceptable to the best interests of the communities we serve. Therefore, we have recommended a third alternative for Board consideration.

Comments to the Red Tape Reduction will be bulleted at each statement and wording gone through by Brown and Shelver. Shelver will then send in recommendations
Adjournment at 8:55 p.m.

Submitted by, Vicky Bryan Secretary

